

REMARKS**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-9 and 24-30 are allowed.

New claim 31 is added and is similar to allowed claim 1, but is written with means-plus-function language. New claim 32 is added and is similar to allowed claim 24, but is written with means-plus-function language. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 31 and 32 should be allowable.

New claim 33 is added and is similar to claim 23, but is written with means-plus-function language.

Claims 11-22 are "objected to".

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-33 are currently pending.

II. OBJECTION TO CLAIM 11

Claim 11 is amended as suggested by the Examiner.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 10 AND 23 UNDER 35 USC 103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER GORO

The present invention as recited, for example, in claim 10, relates to an apparatus which controls tilting of a tilt mirror which is controlled by electrostatic attraction. As recited, for example, in claim 10, the apparatus comprises (a) a control signal producing unit which produces a control signal, for controlling the tilting of the mirror, based on a parameter that determines a target tilt angle of the tilt mirror; and (b) a non-linearity compensation calculating unit which performs voltage approximate calculation *so as to compensate for non-linearity, in the control signal obtained by the control signal producing unit, of electrostatic capacity against the tilt angle of the tilt mirror*. As recited, for example, in claim 10, a driving signal for driving the tilt mirror is thereby produced. Claim 23 recites somewhat similar features.

Goro discloses a compensator (square root calculator) for compensating non-linearities only due to a voltage square term.

However, an electrostatic torque is actually influenced by the non-linearity of the *electrostatic capacity*. Goro's compensator cannot compensate the non-linearity of electrostatic capacity against the tilt angle of the tilt mirror. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Goro does not include any disclosure relating to the compensation of non-linearity of electrostatic capacity against the tilt angle of the tilt mirror.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

August 15, 2005

By:

Paul I. Kravetz

Paul I. Kravetz

Registration No. 35,230

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501